

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 12-18 are newly presented herein. In the Office Action of April 19, 2006, the Examiner objected to claim 1 for ending in a semi-colon rather than a period. Claim 1 has been amended to correct this typographical error. The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner next rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kohler et al. (U.S.P. 6,238,027). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nhep et al. (U.S.P. 6,594,857). The Examiner indicated the allowability of claims 8-11. Applicant appreciates such an indication.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kohler et al., or, in the alternative, as being anticipated by Nhep et al. Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define that which is called for therein. As amended, claim 1 calls for, in part, a plurality of hinge apertures formed along at least a portion of each side plate portion of each mounting bracket and wherein at least one of said hinge apertures includes a slot formed therein. Claim 1 further calls for a door hingably fastenable to said hinge apertures of said mounting bracket opposite said hinge aperture having said slot. The art of record does not disclose, teach, or suggest a secure door assembly as called for in claim 1.

As shown in Fig. 2 of Kohler et al., first hinge part 21.1 and second hinge part 21.2 include carry hinge bolt mounts 22 and hinge bolt mount 29, respectively. As shown in Fig. 2, hinge bolt mounts 22, 29 are generally solid structures and do not include a slot as called for in claim 1. Accordingly, that which is called for claim 1 is not disclosed in Kohler et al.

Similarly, Nhep et al. also does not disclose that which is called for in claim 1. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 14, Nhep et al. discloses a hinge clip 58 that includes a hinge portion 78, a hinge 80, and a clip portion 82. As shown in Fig. 16 of Nhep et al, members 126, 128 and rotatable member 122 are generally solid members constructed to receive hinge pin 81 (as shown in Fig. 14). Although such a construction provides a rotatable connection between plate 86 and portion 82, the pivotable connection of Nhep et al. does not include each and every limitation called for in claim 1. That is, claim 1 calls for a plurality of hinge apertures formed

along at least a portion of each side plate portion of each mounting bracket wherein at least one of said hinge apertures includes a slot formed therein. Nhep et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest such a construction. Accordingly, Applicant believes that which is called for in claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Applicant has amended claim 4 to comport with the amendment of claim 1 and amended claim 6 to correct the dependency thereof. Accordingly, in light of the remarks presented above, Applicant believes claims 1-7 are patentable over the art of record and in condition for allowance. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 8-11. Claims 12-18 are newly presented herein and correspond to the subject matter of allowed claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant believes these claims are also patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance. Applicant has enclosed herewith a check in the amount of \$60.00 for the one-month extension fee required for entry and consideration of the remarks and amendments presented herein.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew John Tarasewicz", written in a cursive style.

Matthew John Tarasewicz

Date: August 15, 2006